

Sorting a Low-Entropy Sequence

STUDENT PAPER

Travis Gagie

Department of Computer Science
University of Toronto
travis@cs.toronto.edu

Abstract. We give the first sorting algorithm with bounds in terms of higher-order entropies: let S be a sequence of length m containing n distinct elements and let $H_\ell(S)$ be the ℓ th-order empirical entropy of S , with $n^{\ell+1} \log n \in O(m)$; our algorithm sorts S using $(H_\ell(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons.

1 Introduction

Sorting in the comparison model is one of oldest problems in computer science, but it remains an important and active area. Previous research has shown how we can take advantage of various kinds of pre-sortedness, such as long runs, few inversions, or only a small number of elements out of place (see [10]); in this paper, we show how we can take advantage of low entropy to reduce comparisons.

Consider a fixed sequence $S = s_1, \dots, s_m$ containing n distinct elements drawn from a total order. For any non-negative integer ℓ , the ℓ th-order empirical entropy of S , denoted $H_\ell(S)$, is our expected uncertainty about s_i (measured in bits) given a context of length ℓ , as in the following experiment: we are given S ; i is chosen uniformly at random from $\{1, \dots, m\}$; if $i \leq \ell$, we are told s_i ; if $i > \ell$, we are told $s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_{i-1}$. Specifically,

$$H_\ell(S) = \begin{cases} \sum_{a \in S} \frac{\#_a(S)}{m} \log \frac{m}{\#_a(S)} & \text{if } \ell = 0; \\ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\alpha \in A_\ell} |S_\alpha| H_0(S_\alpha) & \text{if } \ell > 0. \end{cases}$$

Here, $a \in S$ means a occurs in S ; $\#_a(S)$ is the number of occurrences of a in S ; $\log$ means $\log_2$; A_ℓ is the set of ℓ -tuples in S ; and S_α is the sequence whose i th element is the one immediately following the i th occurrence of α in S . The length of S_α is the number of occurrences of α in S unless α is a suffix of S , in which case it is 1 less.

Notice $\log n \geq H_0(S) \geq \dots \geq H_{m-1}(S) = H_m(S) = \dots = 0$. For example, if S is the string TORONTO, then $\log n = 2$,

$$H_0(S) = \frac{1}{7} \log 7 + \frac{3}{7} \log \frac{7}{3} + \frac{1}{7} \log 7 + \frac{2}{7} \log \frac{7}{2} \approx 1.84,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_1(S) &= \frac{1}{7} (H_0(S_N) + 2H_0(S_O) + H_0(S_R) + 2H_0(S_T)) \\
&= \frac{1}{7} (H_0(T) + 2H_0(RN) + H_0(O) + 2H_0(OO)) \\
&= 2/7 \approx 0.29
\end{aligned}$$

and all higher-order empirical entropies of S are 0. This means, if someone chooses a character uniformly at random from TORONTO and asks us to guess it, then our uncertainty is about 1.84 bits. If they tell us the preceding character before we guess, then on average our uncertainty is about 0.29 bits; if they tell us the preceding two or more characters, then we are certain of the answer. The difference between 0th-order and higher-order empirical entropies can be of practical importance: the encodings produced by most older compression algorithms are only bounded in terms of the 0th-order empirical entropy of the input, whereas those produced by most modern compression algorithms are bounded in terms of higher-order empirical entropies. For example, Manzini [7] proved Burrows and Wheeler’s algorithm [2] encodes S using at most

$$(8H_\ell + O(1))m + N^\ell(2N \log N + 9)$$

bits, where ℓ is any non-negative integer, N is the size of the alphabet and, depending on the implementation, the hidden constant is about $2/25$.

Suppose we want to sort S , that is, to put the elements of S in non-decreasing order. Many familiar sorting algorithms already take advantage of low 0th-order empirical entropy: Munro and Spira [9] proved MergeSort, TreeSort and HeapSort use $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ ternary comparisons¹; by the Static Optimality Theorem [14], SplaySort uses $O((H_0(S) + 1)m)$ comparisons; Sedgewick and Bentley [12] recently proved QuickSort uses $O((H_0(S) + 1)m)$ comparisons in the expected case.

In Section 2 we give a new algorithm that sorts S using $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons. In Section 3 we generalize it so that, given a non-negative integer ℓ with $n^{\ell+1} \log n \in O(m)$, it uses $(H_\ell(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons. Our algorithm’s main disadvantage is its slowness: it takes $O((H_\ell(S) + 1)m \log n + \ell m)$ time, whereas the algorithms mentioned above take $O((H_0(S) + 1)m)$ time. It works in models where, for $t \leq m$, it takes $O(\log t)$ time to perform a standard operation on a balanced binary search tree with t keys, each of $O(\log m)$ bits [3]; if such a tree takes $O(t)$ space, then our algorithm takes $O(m)$ space. We emphasize that we do not make assumptions about the source of S , nor do we use randomization or pointer arithmetic.

¹ A ternary comparison of x and y tells us whether $x < y$, $x = y$ or $x > y$; a binary comparison only tells us whether $x \leq y$ or $x > y$. Our algorithm uses binary comparisons, which is a slight advantage: while most instruction sets support ternary comparisons, most high-level languages do not; a ternary comparison is usually implemented as two binary comparisons [1].

2 Sorting S using $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ Comparisons

If we are given a list of the distinct elements in S and their frequencies, then we can easily sort S using fewer than $(H_0(S) + 2)m$ comparisons: we construct a nearly optimal leaf-oriented binary search tree T , as described in Subsection 2.1, and perform an insertion sort into T . A *leaf-oriented* binary search tree (LBST) is one in which the data are stored at the leaves.

Since we are not given that information, we instead start with an LBST T_1 on s_1 ; for i from 2 to m , we search for s_i in T_{i-1} and then “in effect” construct a new LBST T_i which is nearly optimal for $s_1, \dots, s_i$. In Subsection 2.2 we prove this uses $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons. Of course, actually constructing every T_i would be very slow; in Subsection 2.3, we show how we can quickly “in effect” construct them. We used a similar approach in [5] for dynamic alphabetic coding.

2.1 Constructing a Nearly Optimal Leaf-Oriented Binary Search Tree

Let $a_1, \dots, a_n$ be the distinct elements in S in increasing order. By Shannon’s Noiseless Coding Theorem [13], if we search for $s_1, \dots, s_m$ in an LBST on $a_1, \dots, a_n$, then we use at least $H_0(S)m$ comparisons. Mehlhorn [8] gave an $O(n)$ -time algorithm that, given $a_1, \dots, a_n$ and $\#_{a_1}(S), \dots, \#_{a_n}(S)$, constructs an LBST with which we use fewer than $(H_0(S) + 2)m$ comparisons; we follow Knuth’s [6] presentation.

Theorem 1 (Mehlhorn, 1977). *We can construct a leaf-oriented binary search tree on $a_1, \dots, a_n$ whose leaves have depths $\left\lceil \log \frac{m}{\#_{a_1}(S)} \right\rceil + 1, \dots, \left\lceil \log \frac{m}{\#_{a_n}(S)} \right\rceil + 1$.*

Proof. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let

$$f_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{\#_{a_j}(S)}{m} + \frac{\#_{a_i}(S)}{2m}.$$

Since $|f_i - f_{i'}| > \frac{\#_{a_i}(S)}{2m}$ for $i' \neq i$, the first $\left\lceil \log \frac{m}{\#_{a_i}(S)} \right\rceil + 1$ bits of f_i ’s binary representation suffice to distinguish it; let σ_i be this sequence of bits. Notice $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ are lexicographically increasing.

We construct a binary tree such that, for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq k \leq |\sigma_i|$, the k th edge on the path from the root to the i th leaf is a left edge if the k th bit of σ_i is a 0, and a right edge if it is a 1. We store $a_1, \dots, a_n$ at the leaves. At each internal node v , if v has two children, then we store a pointer to the rightmost leaf in v ’s left subtree. $\square$

Consider the LBST this algorithm produces. When searching for s_i , we start at the root and descend to the leaf that stores s_i , as follows: at each internal node v , if v has two children and the rightmost leaf in v ’s left subtree stores element a , then we compare s_i with a and proceed to v ’s left child or right child

depending on whether $s_i \leq a$; if v has only one child, we proceed immediately to that child. Searching for $s_1, \dots, s_m$, we use a total of at most

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \#_{a_i}(S) \left(\left\lceil \log \frac{m}{\#_{a_i}(S)} \right\rceil + 1 \right) < (H_0(S) + 2)m$$

comparisons.

2.2 Using a Sequence of Leaf-Oriented Binary Search Trees

Let F be the set of indices i such that s_i is the first occurrence of that element in S ; that is, $F = \{i : s_i \notin s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq m$, let T_i be the nearly optimal LBST Mehlhorn's algorithm constructs for $s_1, \dots, s_i$, augmented so that, for $a \in s_1, \dots, s_i$, the leaf storing a also stores a counter set to $\#_a(s_1, \dots, s_i)$ and a list containing the indices of a 's occurrences in $s_1, \dots, s_i$. Consider the concatenation of the lists in T_m , as a permutation: its inverse sorts S .² Thus, with regard to comparisons needed, constructing T_m is equivalent to sorting S ; the following lemmas show $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons suffice.

Lemma 1. *We can construct T_m using at most*

$$\sum_{i \in F - \{1\}} (\lceil \log(i-1) \rceil + 3) + \sum_{i \notin F} \left(\left\lceil \log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} \right\rceil + 3 \right)$$

comparisons.

Proof. By induction. We can construct T_1 without using any comparisons. For $2 \leq i \leq m$, suppose we have T_{i-1} and want to construct T_i . To do this, we first search for s_i in T_{i-1} .

If $s_i \in s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}$, that is, $i \notin F$, then our search uses $\left\lceil \log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} \right\rceil + 1$ comparisons and ends at the leaf storing s_i . Otherwise, our search uses at most $\lceil \log(i-1) \rceil + 1$ comparisons and ends at a leaf storing either s_i 's predecessor or successor in T_{i-1} .

Let a be the element stored at the leaf v where our search ends. We determine whether a is s_i 's predecessor, s_i itself, or s_i 's successor by checking whether $a \leq s_i$ and whether $s_i \leq a$. If a is s_i 's predecessor, then we insert a new leaf immediately to the right of v , that stores s_i , a counter set to 1 and a list containing i ; if $a = s_i$, we increment v 's counter and add i to v 's list; if a is s_i 's successor, then we insert a new leaf immediately to the left of v , that stores s_i , a counter set to 1 and a list containing i .

Notice T_{i-1} 's leaves now contain the same information as T_i 's, which is enough for us to construct T_i without any further comparisons. In total, if $i \notin F$, then we use $\left\lceil \log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} \right\rceil + 3$ comparisons to construct T_i ; otherwise, we use at most $\lceil \log(i-1) \rceil + 3$ comparisons. $\square$

² In fact, if each list in T_m is in increasing order, then their concatenation's inverse stably sorts S ; a *stable* sort preserves equal elements' relative order.

Lemma 2.

$$\sum_{i \in F - \{1\}} \log(i-1) + \sum_{i \notin F} \log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} \leq (H_0(S) + O(1))m .$$

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \sum_{i \in F - \{1\}} \log(i-1) + \sum_{i \notin F} \log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} \\ &< \log(m!) - \sum_{i \notin F} \log \#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}) . \end{aligned}$$

For $i \notin F$, if s_i is the j th occurrence of a in S , then $j \geq 2$ and $\log \#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}) = \log(j-1)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} C &< \log(m!) - \sum_{a \in S} \sum_{j=2}^{\#_a(S)} \log(j-1) \\ &= \log(m!) - \sum_{a \in S} \log(\#_a(S)!) + \sum_{a \in S} \log \#_a(S) \\ &\leq \log(m!) - \sum_{a \in S} \log(\#_a(S)!) + n \log \frac{m}{n} \\ &= \log(m!) - \sum_{a \in S} \log(\#_a(S)!) + O(m) . \end{aligned}$$

By Stirling's Formula,

$$x \log x - x \ln 2 < \log(x!) \leq x \log x - x \ln 2 + O(\log x) .$$

Thus,

$$C \leq m \log m - m \ln 2 - \sum_{a \in S} (\#_a(S) \log \#_a(S) - \#_a(S) \ln 2) + O(m)$$

Since $\sum_{a \in S} \#_a(S) = m$,

$$\begin{aligned} C &\leq \sum_{a \in S} \#_a(S) \log \frac{m}{\#_a(S)} + O(m) \\ &= (H_0(S) + O(1))m . \end{aligned}$$

□

2.3 Using a Statistics Data Structure

Let $T_1, \dots, T_m$ be as defined in Subsection 2.2. Since Mehlhorn's algorithm takes $O(n)$ time, sorting S by constructing $T_1, \dots, T_m$ takes $O(mn)$ time; this is faster than BubbleSort, for example, but still impractical. To save time, we implement all of the T_i s as a single dynamic *statistics* data structure: an augmented balanced binary search tree that stores a list of triples $\langle a_1, w_1, L_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_t, w_t, L_t \rangle$, each of which consists of a key a_j , a positive integer weight w_j and a list L_j . None of the following operations compares keys and each takes $O(\log t)$ time [3]:

search(b): return the smallest j with $\sum_{k=1}^j w_k \geq b$;
sum(j): return $\sum_{k=1}^j w_k$;
triple(j): return $\langle a_j, w_j, L_j \rangle$;
increment(j): increment w_j ;
append(i, j): append i to L_j ;
insert(a, i, j): insert $\langle a, 1, \langle i \rangle \rangle$ into the j th position in the list of triples.

As an aside, we note there are faster statistics data structures on a word RAM (see [11]); we leave as future work investigating whether we can improve our algorithm with one of them.

Lemma 3. *Suppose we have a statistics data structure whose keys and weights are, respectively, the distinct elements in $s_1, \dots, s_i$ and their frequencies. Then given the path from the root to a node v in T_i , we can determine the following in $O(\log n)$ time:*

- if v is a leaf, the element stored at v ;
- whether v has a left child;
- whether v has a right child;
- if v has two children, the element stored at the rightmost leaf in v 's left subtree.

Proof. Let $a_1, \dots, a_t$ be the distinct elements in $s_1, \dots, s_i$ in increasing order and, for $1 \leq j \leq t$, let

$$f_j = \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\#_{a_k}(s_1, \dots, s_i)}{i} + \frac{\#_{a_j}(s_1, \dots, s_i)}{2i}.$$

Given a binary string ρ , we can find the smallest j such that f_j 's binary representation begins ρ , if one exists: let j' be the value returned by **search**($(\cdot, \rho)i$) with $\cdot, \rho$ interpreted as a binary fraction; by T_i 's construction, we know the j we seek is either j' or $j' + 1$; we use **sum**(j'), **triple**(j') and **triple**($j' + 1$) to compute $f_{j'}$ and $f_{j'+1}$, if they are defined.

Let σ be the path from the root to v encoded as a binary string, with each 0 indicating a left edge and each 1 indicating a right edge. We can determine each of the following properties of v in $O(\log t) \subseteq O(\log n)$ time: if there is only one j such that f_j 's binary representation begins σ , then v is a leaf storing a_j ; if v is an internal node and there is a j such that f_j 's binary representation begins $\sigma 0$, then v has a left child; similarly, if v is an internal node and there is a j such that f_j 's binary representation begins $\sigma 1$, then v has a right child; finally, if v has two children, then there is a j such that f_j 's binary representation begins $\sigma 0$ and f_{j+1} 's binary representation begins $\sigma 1$ — the rightmost leaf in v 's left subtree stores a_j . $\square$

For $2 \leq i \leq m$, let $a_1, \dots, a_t$ be the distinct elements in $s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}$. Suppose we have a statistics data structure D implementing T_{i-1} , that is, storing $\langle a_1, \#_{a_1}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}), L_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_t, \#_{a_t}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}), L_t \rangle$ with each L_j containing the indices of a_j 's occurrences in $s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}$. Using D and Lemma 3, if

$s_i \in s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}$, then searching for s_i in T_{i-1} takes $\left\lceil \log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} \right\rceil + 1$ comparisons and $O\left(\left(\log \frac{i-1}{\#_{s_i}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1})} + 1\right) \log n\right)$ time, and returns j such that $a_j = s_i$; otherwise, searching for s_i takes at most $\lceil \log(i-1) \rceil + 1$ comparisons and $O((\log(i-1) + 1) \log n)$ time, and returns j such that a_j is either s_i 's predecessor or successor in T_{i-1} . Determining whether a_j is s_i 's predecessor, s_i itself, or s_i 's successor takes two more comparisons and $O(\log n)$ time. If a_j is s_i 's predecessor, then we use $O(\log n)$ time to insert $\langle s_i, 1, \langle i \rangle \rangle$ into the $(j+1)$ st position in the list of triples; if $a_j = s_i$, then we use $O(\log n)$ time to increment the weight in the triple $\langle a_j, \#_{a_j}(s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}), L_j \rangle$ and append i to L_j ; if a_j is s_i 's successor, then we use $O(\log n)$ time to insert $\langle s_i, 1, \langle i \rangle \rangle$ into the j th position in the list of triples. After this, D implements T_i .

We can construct a statistics data structure implementing T_1 in $O(1)$ time without using any comparisons; by Lemmas 1 and 2, we can use $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons and $O((H_0(S) + 1)m \log n)$ time to construct a statistics data structure implementing T_m ; from this we can obtain the concatenation of the lists in T_m , in $O(m \log n)$ time. Therefore, we can sort S using $(H_0(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons and $O((H_0(S) + 1)m \log n)$ time.

3 Sorting S using $(H_\ell(S) + O(1))m$ Comparisons

To generalize our algorithm, given S and ℓ with $n^{\ell+1} \log n \in O(m)$, we work from left to right and maintain a set of statistics data structures, one for each distinct ℓ -tuple seen so far, and keep track of them using two dictionaries. In effect, we partition S , use the statistics data structures to sort each of the parts, and then merge them. This uses a total of $(H_\ell(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons and $O((H_\ell(S) + 1)m \log n + \ell m)$ time.

3.1 Using a Set of Statistics Data Structures

As we work, we maintain a statistics data structure D_α for each distinct ℓ -tuple α that has occurred so far. Assume we have a black box B that works as follows: for $\ell + 1 \leq i \leq m$, suppose we query B immediately before we process s_i ; if the ℓ -tuple $s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_{i-1}$ has occurred before, then B returns a pointer to $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_{i-1}}$; otherwise, B creates $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_{i-1}}$ and returns a pointer to it; in both cases, querying B costs $O(\log n)$ comparisons and $O(\ell \log n)$ time.

We use B to keep track of the statistics data structures, but we only query it after seeing a new distinct $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple; this way, the total cost of querying B is $O(n^{\ell+1} \log n) \subseteq O(m)$ comparisons and $O(n^{\ell+1} \ell \log n) \subseteq O(\ell m)$ time. We augment the statistics data structures so that, instead of storing just triples, they store quadruples: each $D_{b_1, \dots, b_\ell}$ stores a list of quadruples $\langle a_1, w_1, L_1, p_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_t, w_t, L_t, p_t \rangle$, where p_j is a pointer to $D_{b_2, \dots, b_\ell, a_j}$; as well, $D_{b_1, \dots, b_\ell}$ stores the ranks of $b_2, \dots, b_\ell$, which we define and use later.

To process S , first, we query B to obtain a pointer to a new statistics data structure $D_{s_1, \dots, s_\ell}$. For $\ell + 1 \leq i \leq m$, we search for s_i in the LBST that $D_{s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_{i-1}}$ implements, as in Subsection 2.3. If $s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_i$ has occurred before, then this search returns a quadruple $\langle s_i, w, L, p \rangle$; we increment w , append i to L , and retrieve p , which points to $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_i}$. If $s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_i$ has not occurred before, then we query B to obtain a pointer p to $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_i}$ and insert $\langle s_i, 1, \langle i \rangle, p \rangle$ into $D_{s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_{i-1}}$.

As in Section 1, let A_ℓ be the set of ℓ -tuples in S and, for $\alpha \in A_\ell$, let S_α be the sequence whose j th element is the one immediately following the j th occurrence of α in S . In total, processing S takes

$$O(m) + \sum_{\alpha \in A_\ell} (H_0(S_\alpha) + O(1))|S_\alpha| = (H_\ell(S) + O(1))m$$

comparisons and

$$O(\ell m) + \sum_{\alpha \in A_\ell} O((H_0(S_\alpha) + 1)|S_\alpha| \log n) = O((H_\ell(S) + 1)m \log n + \ell m)$$

time. When we finish processing S , for each $\alpha \in A_\ell$ and each $a \in S_\alpha$, D_α contains a quadruple $\langle a, \#_a(S_\alpha), L, p \rangle$ with L containing the indices of occurrences of a that immediately follow occurrences of α in S .

After we process S , the at most n^ℓ statistics data structures each contain at most n quadruples. Consider all these quadruples, as well as “dummy” quadruples $\langle s_1, 1, \langle 1 \rangle, \text{null} \rangle, \dots, \langle s_\ell, 1, \langle \ell \rangle, \text{null} \rangle$; we sort them all by their keys, which takes $O((n^{\ell+1} + \ell) \log n) \subseteq O(m)$ comparisons and time. Now consider the concatenation of their lists of indices: its inverse sorts S . To see why, notice the indices are in non-decreasing order by the elements they index. Thus, to prove the following theorem, it only remains for us to implement our black box B .

Theorem 2. *Given a sequence $S = s_1, \dots, s_m$ containing n distinct elements and a non-negative integer ℓ with $n^{\ell+1} \log n \in O(m)$, we can sort S using $(H_\ell(S) + O(1))m$ comparisons and $O((H_\ell(S) + 1)m \log n + \ell m)$ time.*

3.2 Using a Dictionary of Elements and a Dictionary of ℓ -tuples

For our black box B , we use two dictionaries, both implemented as balanced binary search trees: B_1 contains the at most n distinct elements seen so far, and B_2 stores $O(\log m)$ -bit encodings of the at most n^ℓ distinct ℓ -tuples seen so far. We search in each dictionary once per query to B , that is, once per distinct $(\ell + 1)$ -tuple in S ; we use a total of $O(n^{\ell+1} \log n) \subseteq O(m)$ comparisons and time searching in B_1 ; we use a total of $O(n^{\ell+1} \ell \log n) \subseteq O(\ell m)$ time searching in B_2 , but no comparisons between elements of S .

We maintain the invariant that, immediately before we process s_i , B_1 stores a set of pairs $\langle a_1, r_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_t, r_t \rangle$, each of which consists of a distinct element $a_j \in s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}$ and a_j ’s rank r_j . We say a_j has *rank* r_j if it is the r_j th distinct element to appear in S ; that is, for some k , the first occurrence of a_j is s_k and

there are r_j distinct elements in $s_1, \dots, s_k$. Notice operations on B_1 use $O(\log n)$ comparisons and time. To query our black box B before processing s_i , we start by searching for s_i in B_1 . If this search succeeds, then we retrieve s_i 's rank; if it fails, then s_i is a new distinct element and we insert $\langle s_i, r \rangle$, where r is the number of distinct elements seen so far, including s_i . After this we have the ranks $r_1, \dots, r_{\ell-1}$ of $s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_{i-1}$, which $D_{s_{i-\ell}, \dots, s_{i-1}}$ stores, and the rank r_ℓ of s_i .

We also maintain the invariant that, immediately before we process s_i , B_2 stores a set of pairs $\langle g_1, p_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle g_{t'}, p_{t'} \rangle$, each of which consists of an $O(\log m)$ -bit encoding g_j of a distinct ℓ -tuple α in $s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}$ and a pointer p_j to D_α . We use the *gamma code* [4] to encode each $a \in \alpha$, which encodes any positive integer x as a binary string $\gamma(x)$ consisting of $\lfloor \log x \rfloor$ copies of 0 followed by the $(\lfloor \log x \rfloor + 1)$ -bit binary representation of x .

Lemma 4. *We can encode any sequence $x_1, \dots, x_\ell$ of positive $O(\log n)$ -bit integers as a unique $O(\log m)$ -bit binary string.*

Proof. The gamma code is prefix-free and, hence, unambiguous: any binary string is the concatenation of at most one sequence of encoded integers. Thus, the encoding $\gamma(x_1) \cdots \gamma(x_\ell)$ is unique and has length $O(\ell \log n) \subseteq O(\log m)$. $\square$

Notice operations on B_2 use $O(\ell \log n)$ time and comparisons between encodings of ℓ -tuples, but no comparisons between elements of S . To query our black box B , after searching for s_i in B_1 , we search for $\gamma(r_1) \cdots \gamma(r_\ell)$ in B_2 . If this search succeeds, then we retrieve a pointer to $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_i}$; if it fails, then $s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_i$ is a new distinct ℓ -tuple, so we create a new statistics data structure $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_i}$ and insert $\langle \gamma(r_1) \cdots \gamma(r_\ell), p \rangle$ into B_2 , where p is a pointer to $D_{s_{i-\ell+1}, \dots, s_i}$.

References

1. A. Andersson. A note on searching in a binary search tree. *Software: Practice & Experience*, 10:1125–1128, 1991.
2. M. Burrows and D.J. Wheeler. A locally adaptive data compression scheme. Technical Report 124, Digital Equipment Corporation, Palo Alto, California, 1994.
3. T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT Press/McGraw-Hill, 2nd edition, 2001.
4. P. Elias. Universal codeword sets and representations of the integers. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 21:194–203, 1975.
5. T. Gagie. Dynamic Shannon coding. In *Proceedings of the 12th European Symposium on Algorithms*, pages 359–370, 2004.
6. D. E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming*, volume 3. Addison-Wesley, 2nd edition, 1998.
7. G. Manzini. An analysis of the Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Journal of the ACM*, 48:407–430, 2001.
8. K. Mehlhorn. A best possible bound for the weighted path length of binary search trees. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6:235–239, 1977.

9. J.I. Munro and P.M. Spira. Searching and sorting in multisets. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5:1–8, 1976.
10. O. Petersson and A. Moffat. A framework for adaptive sorting. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 59:153–179, 1995.
11. M. Pătraşcu and E. Demaine. Tight bounds for the partial-sums problem. In *Proceedings of the 15th Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 20–29, 2004.
12. R. Sedgwick and J. Bentley. Quicksort is optimal. Presented at *Knuthfest*, 2002.
13. C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27:379–423, 623–656, 1948.
14. D. D. Sleator and R. E. Tarjan. Self-adjusting binary search trees. *Journal of the ACM*, 32:652–686, 1985.